

NEXTEL\_(06-22)

---

MR. ARGENIO: Proposed tower and equipment building. This application proposes construction of 120 foot cell tower facility with 12 x 20 foot equipment building with a 50 x 50 fenced in area. Plan reviewed on a concept basis only.

MR. GUADIOSO: Robert Gaudio with the firm of Snyder & Snyder.

MR. ARGENIO: Tell us what you're looking for.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Seeking a special permit and site plan approval for a telecommunications tower for 120 foot monopole, 240 square foot equipment shelter. We met with Mr. Edsall and submitted a number of documents to the board as part of the special permit requirements. The special permit section on telecommunication towers states that the lot area shall be the amount necessary to meet the setbacks and in this case the setbacks are one and a half the height of the tower which would be 60 feet and we do meet that, however, in the bulk table there's a section for cellular antennas that requires a ten acre lot area, we have approximately 3 acres.

MR. ARGENIO: That would be less.

MR. GAUDIOSO: So the question is whether the bulk table controls or whether the text controls. I don't know the answer. If this is a referral to the Zoning Board I guess we'd have to seek those necessary variances and/or an interpretation of the code on that point.

MR. ARGENIO: Mark, what do you think about this?

MR. EDSALL: I know that the, or I believe, I'll put it that way, the thought process on the setback issue that you referenced in the particulars I believe was

intended to address the issue of structural collapse and in the cases where you have a lease that, collapse zones, and the lease area you have to have reserved for specifically that use. I'm not convinced that that means that there wasn't some thought process in creating the bulk table. I don't know that they're in disagreement, I think it just is two different issues but the zoning board will help us out with that.

MR. ARGENIO: Let them make the determination. Also, Mark, on this tower business, I think in the past we certainly have some towers around New Windsor, I think in the past we've asked for and Joe Minuta kind of jarred my memory prior to the meeting, we've asked for some elevations and renderings of sorts.

MR. EDSALL: Well, one of the things that you obviously procedurally need to do is get it over to the ZBA but the applicant has been very cooperative in discussing with us the impact, potential impacts, visual impacts and where such visual evaluations could be made and I think one thing that could possibly be accomplished even if it's not decided tonight but if the applicant can get some feedback from the board reviewing the package they have proposed certain locations to do the visual impacts, we should probably take advantage of the time while they're at the ZBA, look at this, let them know if we believe those locations are acceptable, then they can proceed when they come back they'd have it ready.

MR. ARGENIO: Joe, would you work on that with Mark?

MR. MINUTA: I'd be happy to do that.

MR. ARGENIO: The reason I'm bringing it up is because I don't want to be unfair at a later date to tell you I'm looking for architectural renderings for the benefit of the board to make a better decision. So it's just a heads up for you now.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Rather than rush out and go ahead and do a balloon test and do renderings without the board's input, we held back and what we submitted as Exhibit 4 was topo map showing 7 different locations that we thought would be appropriate to take photographs from so if in the meantime as was suggested while we're at the zoning board process if you can let us know if those are acceptable, if there are additional locations what we'd like to do is then tell you the date we'll do the balloon test, if you have the opportunity to come out and view it yourself, fine, if not, we'll also take pictures and do the renderings.

MR. ARGENIO: Joe Minuta is our resident architect, he looks at things sometimes through a different lens than the rest of us so he'll work with Mark or you or both to determine those locations and we'll move forward. Again, as I said, we're here for a referral to the zoning board and whether they'll be successful or not in achieving their variances, anybody else have anything on this application?

MR. MINUTA: Just a couple questions. How many areas are you proposing?

MR. GAUDIOSO: One but what we did is we showed in the plans that the tower would be built for four and we also submitted as required by the code a letter of intent saying that Nextel would read and negotiate in good faith, make the tower available for co-location and we submitted that as we're proposing one but capable of holding four.

MR. MINUTA: Then with regard to the package you have provided your current coverage area and provided the dead zones?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct, we showed in Exhibit 1 and then 1a, b, c is the number of attachments to one, we showed

the existing coverage, we showed where all our sites are, we showed the proposed coverage, then we looked at as required by the code structures over 35 feet in a two mile radius, we looked at the number of different structures, showed you coverage maps for that and showed you correspondence with two locations that were not interested in leasing to us so that's part of the package.

MR. MINUTA: So I have a note my mind this is right near the Conrail train trestle?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Property abuts it where the train trestle crosses Route 32 just to the south of that.

MR. BABCOCK: Right across from Willow Lane.

MR. MINUTA: So that's basically the lower part of that, okay, that's fine.

MR. GAUDIOSO: We're in the back of the property, it's not a flag lot but shaped like a wide flag pole, we're in the back of the property.

MR. MINUTA: Just for my clarification, the property setbacks meet the fall zone radius?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

MR. ARGENIO: We're early with this. Anybody have anything else? If not, I'll accept a motion to determine this application incomplete at this time.

MR. MINUTA: So moved.

MR. GALLAGHER: Second it.

MR. ARGENIO: Motion has been made and seconded that the Town of New Windsor Planning Board declare Nextel site plan on Chaleff Lane and Route 32 incomplete at

this time. No further discussion, roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. BROWN	AYE
MR. MINUTA	AYE
MR. GALLAGHER	AYE
MR. ARGENIO	AYE

MR. ARGENIO: Thank you, sir. You're on your way.

MR. GAUDIOSO: The only question I had I just took a quick look, does this spell out the necessary variances?

MR. EDSALL: It gives you some corrections that need to be made as far as the data you show in the bulk table and then between the provided values and the corrections you'll make you'll be able to tell which variances and we'll check that when we make the referral.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Thank you for your time this evening, thank you.

MR. ARGENIO: Thank you.